



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,274	12/06/2001	Paula S. Newman	110142	3363

27074 7590 05/20/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
----------

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/683,274

Applicant(s)

NEWMAN, PAULA S.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2175

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Scott M. Schulte (Attorney of Record).

(3) Dov Popovici.

(2) Neveen Abel-Jalil.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 May 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claim 1, and dependent claim 2.

Identification of prior art discussed: Meyer et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143871 A1) and Rhodes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,768 B1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DOV POPOVICI

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant request the after final interview to discuss the cited art Meyer et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143871 A1) and Rhodes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,768 B1) and what the Applicant believes to be a difference between the cited art and the Examiner's characterization of the cited art specifically the recitation of claim 1 "a user modified common word list" and "a lexical context system for creating a lexical context for an identified candidate headword" and additionally how the Applicant believes the difference is claimed in the claimed subject matter.

Examiner indicated to the applicant that the cited art does teach "a lexical context system for creating a lexical context for an identified candidate headword" in Meyer et al. on page 1, paragraphs 0009-0010, wherein Meyer et al. teaches meta-content extraction for organization into an index which automatically indicates the content extracted from the subject of the e-mail message to be placed in a hierarchical order in an index, also see Meyer et al. figure 1, 16, create meta-content index of semantic foci, and on pages 1-2, paragraphs 0009-0018, and pages 7-8, paragraphs 0137, teaches meta-context indexing. A lexicon is already a form of corpus metadata in the sense that it contains more or less generalised descriptive facts about a corpus or introspected data. Meyer et al. teaches semantic foci indexing on page 2, paragraph 0019.

The applicant argued the examiner's characterization of "user modified common word list" found in claim 2 citing that Meyer et al. does not teach the limitation. The Examiner rebutted pointing to the combination of Meyer et al. with Rhodes et al. (See Rhodes et al. column 13, lines 20-48, and see Meyer et al. page 1, paragraphs 0009-0017) to teach the recitation of claim 2. Meyer et al. teaches common word list on pages 3-4, paragraph 0068, and see Meyer et al. page 6, paragraph 0120; while Rhodes et al. on column 7, lines 41-65, and on column 2, lines 53 teaches user modified indexed contextual information. It is therefore clear to the examiner that the combination of Meyer et al. with Rhodes et al. as indicated in the office rejection as a whole read on the limitations of independent claim 1.

The applicant stated that the novelty lays with a user modified common word list for identifying candidate headwords and a lexical context system for creating a lexical context for an identified candidate headword. The applicant indicated to the Examiner that arguments will be drafted and presented in a response to the Non-Final Office action.